

honest with you, up front, it's an amendment that will need to be withdrawn because it related to amendment number one. However, if you could indulge me I'd like to go through it and at least explain to you what's in it and then invite comments from other people because it, because to me, at least, it addresses the other serious deficiency of the resolution, and that is a discussion about how procedurally which elements of the Legislature and by doing what things, how will we get informatio.. about what's going on, what we need to do each year as we engage in this process. I don't know now how many years we intend to engage in this process of bringing it down to two dollars per hundred, but I assume that it will be a period of years now, now undefined, or as yet undefined. And I'm concerned as a member of the Legislature, who's in the Natural Resources Committee and not on the front lines of, of property tax relief as are the Revenue and Appropriations Committees, about how I will get information, what information will get to me, who will be developing that information, and will it be to me in a form that will be, that I'll be able to vote on it, that I'll be able to sort out alternatives and really make an intelligent decision each step of the way about, about what needs to be done and what are the implications and effects of what will be done, and, also what was the results of our last go-round in this property tax relief go-round that will take several years? So what I suggested was that there be an addition to paragraph 4 assuming, and it does a number of things. First of all, it identifies the Revenue and the Appropriations Committee as being the committees that will jointly investigate and make recommendations to the Legislature with regard to this process. That's the first thing it does. And it requires that joint committee to report to the Legislature every year the upcoming program, that is what we're going to do in the next year to bring about the property tax reduction, how much there will be the next year, what the effect of the legislative package will be, that sort of thing. And in addition, it requires that there be three options presented to the Legislature. And the reason I thought this would be good is because it will allow you to clearly think about the different alternatives and how they're, and how they're put together. And the first option will always assume that there's going to be a roughly equivalent, equivalent replacement amount. And that that amount will derive solely from decreasing funding in existing state programs or transferring local programs to the state level. So in other words, it would be saying, for those